



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/708,000

01/30/2004

Steven James McGee

1999

37952

7590

06/30/2006

STEVEN JAMES MCGEE  
82 SEA GIRT AVENUE  
OCEANPORT, NJ 07757

EXAMINER

PATEL, MANGLES M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This **Non-Final** action is responsive to communications: IDS and application filed on January 30, 2004.
2. Claims 1-3 are pending. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

### ***Drawings***

3. The examiner has accepted the Drawings filed on January 30, 2004.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement filed January 30, 2004 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because application number 10/605144 is not prior art because it has not been disclosed or published therefore it cannot be considered. The listed application which is 10/605144 in the specification has already been considered no need to add it to the IDS since it has not been published. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Regarding Independent claim 1**, the claim makes reference to a previous application, the claim should contain a sentence describing the inventive feature, and it is incorrect to make reference to application/publication or patents in a claim.

**Regarding Dependent claim 2**, the claim states “and the like” this phrase renders the claim indefinite since it fails to point out and claim the subject matter of the invention.

**Regarding Dependent claim 3**, the claim is an improper dependent claim because it states “supporting the method of claims 1, 2” it is unclear does applicant mean claim 1 or 2 or only claim 1 and only claim 2, appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 2178

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson (U.S. Pub 2003/0081791, filed Oct 26, 2001) in view of Anvekar (U.S. Pub 2003/0054844, filed Dec 20, 2001).

**Regarding Independent claim 1**, Erickson discloses a method of claim as once structured military messages are converted to XML schemas and proprietary military message parsers are replaced by more efficient and industry standardized commercial parsers as incorporated into software enterprise integration frameworks supported by XML object stores and database technology as described in the previous patent application submitted by this applicant as referenced by this application, the now commercialized military message payloads carrying geospatial and unit organization data and the like can be triggered (timing mechanism) by the ubiquitous TCP/IP heartbeat mechanism for onward dissemination by intelligent software agents (“bots”) as used by newer P2P based products that leverage more modern transport layer protocols such as the Simple Symmetric Transport Protocol (SSTP) thus enabling a universal homeland defense, homeland security alert, data and information exchange supporting method referred to by the applicant as a Homeland Security “heartbeat” (paragraph 29, wherein messages are received by web server and an XML parser determines if the content includes text or XML. The message is processed with SOAP and the web server passes the message through a SOAP gateway that is then directed to a computing module, the module then processes the message on the basis of the character strings within the various XML tags). However Erickson fails to teach the conversion of text to XML tagged text.

Anvekar teaches the conversion of a message from text to XML tagged text (paragraphs 27, 29, 46 and 47, wherein raw text is converted into Extensible Markup Language XML format wherein data items are tagged by customized XML tags). Erickson and Anvekar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of message exchange using XML. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the conversion of text to XML tag data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the processing of the SM contents to become easier for other functional entities in the system by the inclusion of XML tags. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Anvekar with Erickson for the benefits of allowing message exchange by conversion from text to XML through gateways thereby providing easier processing within the system.

**Regarding Dependent claim 2**, with dependency of claim 1, Erickson discloses a method of claim supporting the primary claim where the ubiquitous TCP/IP heartbeat mechanism is used to define the name of the host computers participating in data exchanges and the time interval to poll, gather from, or send data to is set to desired intervals (heartbeat mechanism, e.g., fifteen minutes), an intelligent agent residing in a commercial product monitoring this process gathers the target data from designated queues then passes the collected data to the selected commercial product's commercial XML Object Store for temporary queuing/storage prior to onward dissemination by an XML (Simple Object Access Protocols-SOAP) messaging relay in the form of alerts, messages, tables and the like as stipulated by participating platforms as XML structures

Art Unit: 2178

(Schemas) (paragraph 29). However Erickson fails to teach the conversion of text to XML tagged text. Anvekar teaches the conversion of a message from text to XML tagged text (paragraphs 27, 29, 46 and 47, wherein raw text is converted into Extensible Markup Language XML format wherein data items are tagged by customized XML tags).

Erickson and Anvekar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of message exchange using XML. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the conversion of text to XML tag data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the processing of the SM contents to become easier for other functional entities in the system by the inclusion of XML tags. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Anvekar with Erickson for the benefits of allowing message exchange by conversion from text to XML through gateways thereby providing easier processing within the system.

**Regarding Dependent claim 3**, with dependency of claim 1, Erickson discloses placing the commercial equivalent tools used to configure what is known as the “lower tactical internet or lower TI” for the United States Army into commercial software developmental frameworks tools layers given that commercial networks configure router MIBs and multicast groups as well as organize for tasks by unit or organization (paragraph 29).

Erickson and Anvekar are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of message exchange using XML. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the conversion of text to XML tag data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the processing of the SM

Art Unit: 2178

contents to become easier for other functional entities in the system by the inclusion of XML tags. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Anvekar with Erickson for the benefits of allowing message exchange by conversion from text to XML through gateways thereby providing easier processing within the system.

*It is noted that any citation `[[s]]` to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. `[[See, MPEP 2123]]`*

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/708,000  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 8

Manglesh M. Patel  
Patent Examiner  
June 23, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Hong', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

**STEPHEN HONG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**